

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. This paper amends claim 1, 3, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, and 18; and adds new claims 19 and 20. Minor informalities were corrected in claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, and 18. Support for the new claims 19 and 20 may be found, for example, in the specification, at page 10, lines 17-24, and at page 11, lines 24-31. Applicant believes these amendments to the claims add no new matter to the application and are fully supported by the original disclosure.

In the Office Action mailed on August 1, 2006, claims 1, 6, 7, and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung, U.S. Patent Number 6,195,705 ("Leung" hereinafter) in view of Warriar *et al.*, U.S. Patent Number 6,707,809 ("Warrior"); claims 2, 3, 8-13, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Warriar and further in view of Moy, OSPF Version 2, Request for Comments: 1583 (March 1994) ("Moy"); finally, claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung in view of Warriar and Moy, and further in view of Saleh *et al.*, U.S. Patent Number 6,801,496 ("Saleh").

Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Art Rejections

In rejecting independent claims 1, 3, and 14, the Examiner acknowledged that Leung does not explicitly teach deleting anchor point each time a session between an access terminal and the network ends. The Examiner then sought to combine Leung with Warriar to overcome this admitted gap in Leung's disclosure. In particular, the Examiner cited Warriar at column 7, lines 6-18, as disclosing deletion of anchor point.

Warrior was filed on February 1, 2000, after the priority date of the present application. Warrior was issued on an application that is a continuation-in-part of application serial number 09/354,659, now Xu *et al.*, U.S. Patent Number 6,738,362 ("Xu"). Xu in turn issued on an application that is a continuation-in-part of application serial number 09/248,617, now Pierce, Jr., *et al.*, U.S. Patent Number 6,560,217 ("Pierce"). Thus, the effective §102(e) reference date of

Warrier predates the filing date of the present application only with respect to subject matter found in Xu or Pierce. *See, e.g.*, MPEP §2136.03(IV).

Even assuming that Warrier discloses anchor point deletion as asserted by the Examiner – and we make no such admission – Warrier’s text cited in the Office Action is not found in either Xu or Pierce. Furthermore, we have perused both Xu and Pierce but have not identified in either one of these documents a disclosure of anchor point deletion as recited in claims 1, 3, and 14. It appears that neither Xu nor Pierce discloses anchor point deletion as recited in independent claims 1, 3, and 14 of the present application.

At least for this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 3, and 14 are patentable over the references. Dependent claims 2, 4-13, and 15-18 should be patentable at least for the same reason as their respective base claims, as discussed above.

New Claims 19 and 20

New claims 19 and 20 should also be patentable together with their base claim 1. Additionally, these claims recite that the step deleting includes deleting an instance of a dedicated controller in an MPC, and deleting an instance of a dedicated transmitter in an MPT, respectively. The references apparently do not teach or suggest these limitations.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 31, 2006

By: 

Larry Moskowitz, Reg. No. 42,911
(858) 651-4556

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502